Title and Registration User's System for Tennessee - TRUST
RFP # 317.30.004 – Attachment 9.15
Amendments/Clarifications/Questions

Responses to Written Comments -- May 17, 2001

#	Question	Response
	Note: in the questions that follow, any vendor's restatement of the text of the TRUST Request for Proposals (RFP) is for reference purposes only and shall not be construed to change the original RFP wording.	
34	The Pre-bid conference was very informative and well done. Thank you for sending the information about the bid. My company is not able to supply the products and software for the entire bid. However, we would like to contact the people who attended the conference from [Vendor Name]. We currently purchase a large volume of equipment throught them and think we might be able to align with [Vendor Name] to come up with a complete solution for your needs. Please email me the names and if possible the contact phone number of the gentlemen that attended the conference.	A list containing the companies represented at the Pre-Proposal Conference and those that have submitted a Letter of Intent to Propose will be published shortly after the "Deadline for Letter of Intent to Propose."
35	As a result of questions anticipated and the time required for your team to respond, would the Tennessee TRUST team consider an extension to the June 8th submission date for responses?	The State does not intend to extend the Deadline for Submitting a Proposal.
36	Attachment O, page 484 talks about Capacity Evaluation Test. Are there any software standards for capacity testing tools?	No. The State does not have a software standard for capacity testing tools.
37	Page 65, Section 2.6 - Who is the State's Merchant Services Contractor? What interfaces do they provide (i.e. Java, XML, etc.)?	a. The State's Merchant Services Contractor is Key Merchant Services; the third-party processor is Nova. b. Nova provides two TCPIP Interfaces written in C++ which support the Microsoft environment (NT 95,98) and an SSL Interface which supports Unix and non-Microsoft environments. In addition, see the State's Responses to Written Comments, May 11, 2001, item 33.
38	Page 30, Section A.3 - The RFP says the State has completed the first 2 deliverables in its methodology. Was it the State or was it a vendor contracted to the State? If a vendor completed these deliverables who was that vendor?	The State is beyond the first two ITM phases. However, the State was not using the ITM at the beginning of the TRUST project. Therefore, the State did not complete ITM deliverables for these phases. See Responses to Written Comments dated May 9, 2001, item 7. See the May 9, 2001 responses; item 15 for the contractors that assisted the State in the preparation of the RFP.
39	Page 318, Item 45 - HTML and JavaScript are requirements for the client interface. Is it acceptable to use Java Server Pages (JSP), PL/SQL Server Pages or Active Server Pages (ASP) code as well?	In principle, the products listed are acceptable. However, the vendor is responsible for ensuring that the solution proposed meets the State's requirements, that the various products are compatible with one another, and that they are compatible with the State's standard Technical Architecture.

Title and Registration User's System for Tennessee - TRUST
RFP # 317.30.004 – Attachment 9.15
Amendments/Clarifications/Questions

Responses to Written Comments -- May 17, 2001

#	Question	Response
40	Page 319, Item 61 - The State indicates 24x7 for the system availability to Internet users. Is it correct in assuming that there will be some scheduled downtime (i.e. the state does not see the need for a fully redundant system)? If so, what is the percent up-time that is expected and is there a window of time that is considered best for this scheduled downtime?	The State does not plan downtime for Internet accessible applications. Our portal vendor is contracted for 100% up time for the portal. Backend applications accessed through the portal obviously need to be available to the portal. There are occasions when components of our technical architecture may need to be repaired or replaced and the system may be down for brief periods. However, these are not planned down times.
41	Section 4 of Contract Attachment A, Page 55 states mandatory software standards for the RFP. Since there are mandatory requirements for DBMS, Web Server and Internet Application Development Tools, is there a mandatory requirement for Application Server as well?	Yes. See Amendment 2, item 1, which amends the list of "Category/Sub-Category" areas to include "Software: Application Server."

In addition, this amendment also changes a Category/Sub-Category name from "Software: Internet Application Development Tools" to "Software: Application Development Languages/Tools." |
42	Section 4 of Contract Attachment A, Page 55 states mandatory software standards for the RFP. The list includes "Internet Application Development Tools". However, the chart "Hardware/Software Products Standards" in attachment 9.11 does not specifically list "Internet Application Development Tools". Does the state consider "Internet Application Development Tools" synonymous with the listed "Application Development Languages/Tools", or is there a separate list of "Internet Application Development Tools" standards ?	See response to item 41 above.
43	Attachment N, page 483 shows the start of the start of the 12-month Warranty Period as June 9, 2003. The contract (section A.8.a.) states that the 12-month warranty period begins "upon the State's written acceptance of the implementation of TRUST in all Phase 1 implementation sites". According to the Implementation Schedule in Attachment N that date would be December 9, 2002. What is the correct date to use for calculating the start of the 12-month Warranty Period?	See Amendment 1, dated May 3, 2001. Note however, that all dates in Attachment N are tentative and subject to change at the State's discretion.
44	Contract Attachment P specifies the number of trainees by type of training class. Contract section a.6 page 32 requires training costs to be "rolled into" the cost for the milestones. Given this scenario, one proposer could propose one day of training per class and submit that cost, whereas another proposer that was more knowledgeable about the subject matter and had more experience with the change management needed for this type of implementation might propose substantially more training to accomplish this objective. In this case the second proposer will be penalized in the cost evaluation for being more	For purposes of preparing the Proposal, the vendor shall assume that for each category of training listed in Contract Attachment P the number of training days is three (3) days per individual trained. For example, each individual trained for the Acceptance Test Team would attend three days of training; each individual trained for System Operation and Maintenance would attend three days of training; and so on for the remaining categories.

Title and Registration User's System for Tennessee - TRUST
RFP # 317.30.004 – Attachment 9.15
Amendments/Clarifications/Questions

Responses to Written Comments -- May 17, 2001

#	Question	Response
	accurate in the estimates, and the ability of the first proposer to meet the training objective would not be known to the state until the implementation phase. In order to ensure the state is able to evaluate the cost proposals on an equal basis, the state could specify the minimum number of days per class for all proposers to use when costing the training. Determining the actual number of training days required for each class can be done later in the project when actual training requirements are finalized. Will the state entertain such a change to the requirements and provide a minimum number of days for costing purposes?	
45	Pages 66-67, Section 2.7.5 A twenty-day review cycle for each deliverable has the potential to create large blocks of non-productive time in the project schedule and result in a higher cost to the project. Is the state willing to consider a range of review cycles based on the scope of the deliverable that could be less than 20 days for certain deliverables?	The State will not consider a range of review cycles based on the scope of the deliverable. However, the State will review all deliverables as quickly as possible.
46	The RFP is unquestionably geared to a response offering an in-house solution for the title storage and retrieval problem. While we are geared (via teaming arrangements) to enable us to respond to this issue in the requested manner, we are also able to provide an outsourced solution, similar to one which we have installed in the State of Florida and which we feel would be significantly more economical for the State of Tennessee. Before expending the effort and cost of developing a response, we want to know whether an outsource solution would be considered by the evaluation committee for this RFP.	Under this procurement, an outsourced solution is not acceptable.